

REMARKS**Summary of the Claims**

The Office Action mailed September 17, 2003 has been reviewed and the comments of the Patent and Trademark Office have been considered. Claims 1-11, 13-41, and 43-64 were pending in the application. Claims 2 and 24 have been amended, no claims have been canceled or newly added. Therefore, claims 1-11, 13-41, and 43-64 are pending and applicant respectfully requests entry and reconsideration based on the instant amendment and reply because it is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, are presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,461,708 to Kahn (hereafter "Kahn"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

First, with respect to independent claims 1, 22, 23, 30, 31, 52, and 53, one of the features of the claimed invention is that (1) a report format is identified, (2) a user indication of one of the totals is received, and (3) a graph is generated using a predefined rule corresponding to one of totals to generate a graph. That is, the user only selects one of the totals (and not the underlying report data) and the provided system automatically determines the underlying report data (using a predefined rule) and generates a graph using the automatically determined underlying report data.

Second, as further recited in claim 2, the report data comprises report data from a report generated by another application and the predefined rule for generating a graph is derived from the identified report format of the report generated by another application. Claims 24 further recites that using the identified report format to automatically identify the underlying report data corresponding to the one of the totals indicated by the user and using the automatically identified underlying report data to generate the graph.

These recited features are not disclosed or suggested by Kahn.

Specifically, Kahn does *not* disclose that a user specifies a total and that a graph is generated corresponding to that total by automatically determining the underlying data corresponding to that total. Rather, Kahn discloses that the report data block itself (and NOT the total) has to be specified by the user. In each of the examples of Fig. 6 (and its description in the text of the Kahn patent), the user selects the report data itself (and NOT the total). See report data block 610 in Fig. 6B, 620 in Fig. 6C, 630 in Fig. 6D, 640 in Fig. 6E, 650 in Fig. 6F, 660 in Fig. 6G, and 670 in Fig. 6H. In fact, in each of these figures, the total field is disclosed but not labeled because it is not used by Kahn (See the “Total” row in each of these figures).

Rather, Kahn is concerned with automatically determining a graph type once the report data itself has been selected by a user. See col. 12, line 25, which headlines the discussion of Fig. 6 and is titled “Automated selection of graph *type*.” In this context, the Office Action also cites to col. 11, lines 5-52, which also merely discusses the various types of graphs while col. 9, lines 8-27, relates to how the graph is created (i.e., defines legends used in the graph, etc.). Nowhere does Kahn teach or suggest the claimed features that the report data is automatically determined (using a predefined rule) based on a user selection of a total. Accordingly, the pending independent claims are believed to be patentable over Kahn.

One of the advantages of the claimed invention is that it uses application output reports which have been output, not to create graphs, but to provide information to the users. Kahn uses the data (spreadsheet data) that is prepared for generating graphs. Therefore, the user is spared the task of identifying the report blocks as is required by Kahn. Therefore, neither the claimed features nor its advantages are disclosed or suggested by Kahn.

In other words, the claimed invention provides for identifying the data structure of the reports that comprise data that the user desires to utilize to generate graphs, using, for example, the control break key, the process of identifying the total values (vertical, horizontal, cross totals), and the process of generating graphs by designating the total values in the report identified in the foregoing process.

In sharp contrast, in Kahn, the spreadsheet data is readily used to generate graphs and the claimed analytical process is not required and not disclosed in Kahn. Kahn is directed to

generating graphs in the style (i.e., graph type) that the system selects most appropriate for the report data block that is selected by a user.

In addition, to the differences discussed above, there are additional differences between features recited in the pending claims and Kahn.

For example, claims 1, 30, 31, 60, and 61 recite the concept of hierarchical structure of data groups, while Kahn refers to the data over multiple sheets in a spreadsheet file. It appears that Office Action implies that the collection of sheets in the file, such as areas, countries and summary shown in Fig. 6 in Kahn, corresponds to the claimed hierarchical structure. However, Kahn does not refer to generating graphs, by identifying the hierarchical structure of the data of the foregoing sheets. Therefore, even if a graph is generated from the summary sheet data, such data has to be separately prepared for the summary sheet. And such graph would be still one dimensional (not hierarchical), and only the data explicitly included in the spreadsheet could be used for graph generation.

Claims 63 and 64 disclose a process of identifying the totals in the time-series reports (i.e., the same report over different time periods) and generating graphs by designating such totals, while Kahn does not refer to such time-series process. Furthermore, Kahn does not disclose that such a time series data for graphs could be generated based on a user's indication of only a total since Kahn does not disclose generating a graph based on a user only indicating a total (and not a report data block as is required by Kahn).

Claims 22, 23, 52, and 53 recite displaying the linked corresponding different value when the user clicks a certain feature in the graph. Such a feature is also not disclosed or suggested by Kahn. In this regard, the Office Action cites to col. 12, lines 35-45 of Kahn which only shows that clicking on a report data block generates a graph (which in some sense is the opposite of this claimed feature).

Since these additional features are also not disclosed or suggested by Kahn, they provide additional reasons for the patentability of these claims.

The dependent claims are also patentable for at least the same reasons as the respective independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a whole.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. An early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the application, or if an examiner's amendment would facilitate the allowance of one or more of the claims, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account No. 19-0741 for any such fees; and applicant hereby petitions for any needed extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 17, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By Aaron C. Chatterjee

William T. Ellis

Registration No. 26,874

Aaron C. Chatterjee

Registration No. 41,398

Attorneys for Applicant